



## Longleaf Middle School

1160 Longreen Parkway  
Columbia, SC 29229

<b>Grades</b>	6-8 Middle School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	646 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Katinia Blake Davis	803-691-4870
<b>Superintendent</b>	Katie Brochu	803-787-1910
<b>Board Chair</b>	The Honorable Calvin	803-736-3111

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2012 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2012</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>Average</b>
2011	Average	Average
2010	Average	Average
2009	Average	Average
2008	Below Average	At-Risk

## DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Below Average – School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- At-Risk – School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE VISION

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities.

<http://ed.sc.gov>  
<http://www.eoc.sc.gov>

Percent of Student PASS Records Matched for Purpose of Computing Growth Rating

Percent of students tested in 2011-12 whose 2010-11 test scores were located


96.3%

ABSOLUTE RATINGS OF MIDDLE SCHOOLS WITH STUDENTS LIKE OURS\*

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	At-Risk
6	22	29	1	0

\* Ratings are calculated with data available by 11/07/2012.

Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS)



\* Middle schools with Students Like Ours are middle schools with poverty indices of no more than 5% above or below the index for the school.

Definition of Critical Terms

Exemplary	"Exemplary" means the student demonstrated exemplary performance in meeting the grade level standard.
Met	"Met" means the student met the grade level standard.
Not Met	"Not Met" means that the student did not meet the grade level standard.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

End of Course Tests

Percent of tests with scores of 70 or above on:	Our Middle School	Middle Schools with Students Like Ours
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	94.2%	97.2%
English 1	N/A	95.2%
Physical Science	N/A	N/A
US History and the Constitution	N/A	N/A
All Subjects	94.2%	96.7%

School Profile

	Our School	Change from Last Year	Middle Schools with Students Like Ours	Median Middle School
<b>Students (n=646)</b>				
Students enrolled in high school credit courses (grades 7 & 8)	24.8%	N/R	33.1%	22.9%
Retention rate	0.9%	Down from 1.4%	0.7%	0.8%
Attendance rate	97.9%	Up from 97.4%	96.0%	96.2%
Served by gifted and talented program	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
With disabilities other than speech	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Older than usual for grade	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	1.2%	N/R	0.8%	0.5%
Annual dropout rate	0.0%	No Change	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Teachers (n=49)</b>				
Teachers with advanced degrees	53.1%	Down from 55.8%	61.9%	61.3%
Continuing contract teachers	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV
Teachers returning from previous year	83.1%	Up from 80.0%	89.0%	86.7%
Teacher attendance rate	91.3%	Down from 92.3%	95.1%	95.2%
Average teacher salary*	\$46,077	Down 0.5%	\$46,981	\$46,422
Professional development days/teacher	16.7 days	N/R	10.1 days	10.0 days
<b>School</b>				
Principal's years at school	5.0	N/R	4.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	22.9 to 1	N/R	22.4 to 1	22.0 to 1
Prime instructional time	N/R	N/R	89.4%	90.1%
Opportunities in the arts	Good	Up from Poor	Good	Good
SACS accreditation	Yes	Up from No	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	98.9%	N/R	98.2%	98.8%
Character development program	Excellent	N/R	Good	Good
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$9,104	Down 2.1%	\$6,969	\$7,245
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	67.5%	Up from 66.4%	64.5%	63.1%
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	64.2%	Up from 64.0%	62.6%	60.9%

\* Includes current year teachers contracted for 185 or more days.

\*\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable N/AV–Not Available N/C–Not Collected N/R–Not Reported I/S–Insufficient Sample

## Report of Principal and School Improvement Council

Longleaf Middle School is a school where “Children Have Deep Roots and Branching Aspirations”, and the 2011-2012 school year was another successful year of creating great learning community for our students. We expanded our magnet program, The School for Zoological and Botanical Studies, to the 8th Grade and increased our community partnerships to bring the sciences to life for our students. The students in the magnet enjoyed traveling to Riverbanks Zoo and Botanical Gardens, Congaree Swamp and Clemson Extension to experience learning beyond the classroom.

This year we continued our focus on designing engaging work for our students by studying Dr. Phil Schlechty's book, *Engaging Student: The Next Level of Working on the Work*, which we will continue to study and implement in the 2012-2013 school year. We had staff members present and attend numerous local, state and national conferences. We continued our work with *Making Middle Grades Work* and received a positive technical assistance visit that commended our continuous commitment to school improvement and engaging families and community in the school environment.

Our students enjoyed several new courses including Video Game Design and Video Production. Our Band, Orchestra and Chorus had another successful year scoring either Excellent or Superior at several festivals and competitions. Our students continue to connect to our community through a variety of service learning projects such as collecting non-perishable food items, donations to a variety of charities and supporting our district's Special Olympics. Our students' greatest project this year was raising money to purchase an iPad for our school nurse, Pam Sanders, who was battling leukemia. She enjoyed the student's gift until she lost her fight at the end of the school, and she will be missed as a member of our Leopard family. Our media specialist sponsored our “Read for Beads” program, which was a competition between grade levels to determine which grade would read the most pages, and an individual competition which allowed students to compete for an electronic reader. Our afterschool director expanded the program to include more direct tutoring from certified teachers, healthy cooking and an organized physical fitness program. Our instructional technology specialist worked with teachers to implement a pilot one to one computing program to help with the selection of a device for the 2012-2013 school year. Our instructional team designed and implemented a Quality Work program that allowed students to focus on continuous improvement by attending tutoring to have opportunities to re-do or retake assignments or tests.

During the 2011-2012 school year, we focused on shared leadership, which resulted in more focus and consistency. We are excited to continue to grow and share leadership in 2012 -2013 and know that we will continue to improve with the support of our stakeholders.

Katinia Blake Davis, Principal  
Glenda Green, PTO/ SIC Chairperson

## Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	41	137	64
Percent satisfied with learning environment	63.4%	58.8%	85.5%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	85.4%	65.9%	81.3%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	70.7%	69.9%	80.6%

\* Only students at the highest middle school grade level and their parents were included.

## Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable   N/AV–Not Available   N/C–Not Collected   N/R–Not Reported   I/S–Insufficient Sample

ESEA/Federal Accountability Rating System

In July 2012, the South Carolina Department of Education was granted a waiver from several accountability requirements of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This waiver allowed SC to replace the former pass/fail system with one that utilizes more of the statewide assessments already in place and combine these subject area results with graduation rate (in high schools) to determine if each school met the target or made progress toward the target. This analysis results in a letter grade for the school rather than the pass/fail system of previous years. For a detailed review of the matrix for each school and districts that determined the letter grade, please use the following link: <http://ed.sc.gov/data/eSEA/> or request this information from your child's district or school.

Overall Weighted Points Total	76.6
Overall Grade Conversion	C

Index Score	Grade	Description
90-100	A	Performance substantially exceeds the state's expectations.
80-89.9	B	Performance exceeds the state's expectations.
70-79.9	C	Performance meets the state's expectations.
60-69.9	D	Performance does not meet the state's expectations.
Less than 60	F	Performance is substantially below the state's expectations

Accountability Indicator for Title I Schools

Longleaf Middle School school has been designated as a:

- ☐ Title I Reward School for Performance - among the highest performing Title I schools in a given year.
- ☐ Title I Reward School for Progress – one of the schools with substantial progress in student subgroups.
- ☐ Title I Focus School – one of the schools with the highest average performance gap between subgroups.
- ☐ Title I Priority School – one of the 5% lowest performing Title I schools.
- ☐ Title I School – does not qualify as Reward, Focus or Priority School.
- ☒ Non-Title I School – therefore the designations above are not applicable.

Teacher Quality and Student Attendance

	Our District	State
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	3.5%	2.6%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	0.0%	5.1%

	Our School	State Objective	Met State Objective
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	30.8%	0.0%	No
Student attendance rate	97.9%	94.0%*	Yes

\* Or greater than last year

Abbreviations for Missing Data

Performance By Group

Subgroups	ELA Mean	Math Mean	Science Mean	Social Studies Mean	ELA % Tested	Math % Tested
-----------	----------	-----------	--------------	---------------------	--------------	---------------

Grades 6-8

All Students	638.7	628.9	620.2	612.4	99.4	99.2
Male	629.4	623.1	615.7	611.7	98.6	98.3
Female	646.3	633.6	623.7	613.0	100.0	100.0
White	671.3	653.8	650.1	633.5	100.0	100.0
African American	633.2	624.0	614.3	608.1	99.2	99.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.0	100.0
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	591.5	592.8	571.2	581.5	98.4	96.7
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	628.4	622.2	608.8	604.8	99.5	99.5
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	624.0	624.0	624.0	624.0	95.0	95.0

Abbreviations for Missing Data

PASS Performance By Grade Level

	Grade	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Not Met	% Met	% Exemplary	% Met or Exemplary
English/Language Arts							
2011	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	200	100	24.2	33.2	42.6	75.8
	7	205	98.5	35.4	36.5	28.1	64.6
	8	174	100	36.6	40.4	23	63.4
2012	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	240	99.6	36.2	32.6	31.2	63.8
	7	214	100	26	39.8	34.2	74
	8	193	98.5	42.1	34.3	23.6	57.9
Mathematics							
2011	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	200	100	23.7	56.8	19.5	76.3
	7	205	98.5	40.6	42.7	16.7	59.4
	8	174	100	51.6	39.8	8.7	48.4
2012	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	240	99.2	34.5	44.1	21.4	65.5
	7	214	100	29.6	45.9	24.5	70.4
	8	193	98.5	56.7	36	7.3	43.3
Science							
2011	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	101	100	29.9	55.7	14.4	70.1
	7	205	98.5	30.7	54.2	15.1	69.3
	8	89	94.4	49.4	34.6	16	50.6
2012	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	123	95.9	43.9	49.5	6.5	56.1
	7	214	100	28.6	44.9	26.5	71.4
	8	97	97.9	40.2	51.1	8.7	59.8

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

PASS Performance By Grade Level

	Grade	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Not Met	% Met	% Exemplary	% Met or Exemplary
--	-------	----------------------------------	----------	-----------	-------	-------------	-----------------------

Social Studies

2011	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	101	99	17	67	16	83
	7	205	98.1	33.5	35.1	31.4	66.5
	8	85	100	39.2	46.8	13.9	60.8
2012	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	115	97.4	36.4	47.3	16.4	63.6
	7	214	99.5	43.9	41.8	14.3	56.1
	8	95	92.6	50.6	34.1	15.3	49.4

Writing

2011	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	7	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	175	95.4	37.5	45.6	16.9	62.5
2012	3	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	7	N/A	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	193	94.3	32.4	40.5	27.2	67.6

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable

N/AV–Not Available

N/C–Not Collected

N/R–Not Reported

I/S–Insufficient Sample